

CRANSTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

BUDGET ADOPTION

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2012

WESTERN HILLS MIDDLE SCHOOL

400 PHENIX AVENUE

EXECUTIVE SESSION: 6:00 P.M.

IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWED BY PUBLIC MEETING

IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWED BY PUBLIC BUDGET WORK SESSION

MINUTES

The Budget Adoption meeting of the Cranston School Committee was held on the evening of the above date in the library of Western Hills Middle School with the following members present: Chairperson Iannazzi, Mr. Traficante, Mrs. Ruggieri, Mr. Bloom, Mrs. McFarland, Mr. Lombardi and Mrs. Culhane.

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. and convened to Executive Session pursuant to RI State Laws PL 42-46-5(a)(1) Personnel (Discussion of Termination of Non-Certified Employee A), (Discussion of Termination of Non-Certified Employee B); PL 42-46-5(a)(2) Collective Bargaining and Litigation (Ahlquist vs. Cranston School Committee), (Contract Negotiations' Update-Custodians, Secretaries), (Consideration of legal options regarding status of aid to education appropriation and legal advice relating to same).

Call to Order – Public Session – The Pledge of Allegiance was conducted; Public Session was called to order at 7:20 p.m. The roll was called. A quorum was present.

Chairperson Iannazzi reported out that no votes were taken during Executive Session.

Executive Session Minutes Sealed – February 13, 2012 – Moved by Mrs. Culhane, seconded by Mr. Lombardi and unanimously carried to be sealed.

Public Acknowledgements / Communication – There are none.

Chairperson's Communications – There are none.

Superintendent's Communications

Mr. Nero reported that two weeks ago on Sunday, the two high school football teams had their banquets. What a great occasion to be with all of our athletes and their families and we really enjoyed the day itself.

Also, Mr. Nero reported that the Military Ball is scheduled for March 31, 2012.

He also reported that they were summoned to RIDE by the Commissioner who presented the NECAP scores and she asked that

he bring the administration from both Park View and Western Hills for their extraordinary jobs in Mathematics. We were there along with several other districts to receive this praise. I would also like to let you know that the concern that I have in regards to the test scores is the continuing growth of poverty in our district and the impact that it is having on our test scores. Thank you.

School Committee Member Communications – There were none.

Public Hearing

- a. Students (Agenda/Non-agenda Matters) – There were none.**
- b. Members of the Public (Agenda Matters Only) – There were none.**

Consent Agenda/Consent Calendar

The Proposed Consent Agenda are Resolutions 12-2-2, 12-2-3, 12-2-4, 12-2-5, 12-2-6, 12-2-7, 12-2-8, 12-2-9, 12-2-10, 12-2-11, 12-2-12, 12-2-13, 12-2-14 and 12-2-17. Moved by Mr. Lombardi, seconded by Mrs. McFarland. All were in favor.

ADMINISTRATION - PERSONNEL

NO. 12-02-02 - RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following certified personnel be appointed for the 2011-2012 school year:

Carolyn Steward, Step 4 + Masters

Education...RIC, BA, Simmons College, MS

Experience...North Kingstown

Certification...Library Media

Assignment...Itinerant .5 FTE

Effective Date...January 24, 2012

Authorization...Replacement

Fiscal Note...12216030 51110

NO. 12-02-03 – RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following certified personnel be appointed as substitutes on a temporary basis as needed:

James DiPrete, Principal

Sarah Ferry, Music PK-12

Sarah Cortazzo, Elementary Teacher

Lindsay Roumelis, Art PK-12

Anthony Soscia, Principal

Thomas Hazard, Principal

Russell Rapose, Principal

NO. 12-02-04 – RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the resignation(s) of the following certified personnel be accepted:

Jonathan Wilk, Teacher

Cranston West

Effective Date...June 30, 2012

NO. 12-02-05 – RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following individual(s) be appointed as volunteer coach(s):

Cranston High School West

Kenneth Fogarty Boys' Hockey

NO. 12-02-06 - RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following individual(s) be reappointed as volunteer coaches:

Cranston High School West

Daniel Archetto Girls' Fast Pitch

NO. 12-02-07 RESOLVED, Whereas, there may be more qualified teachers who will apply for current positions, and a better fit for the district, and

Whereas, certain positions became available after the teacher selection of July 27, 2011 and more senior and/or qualified teachers may elect to occupy these positions, and

Whereas, there is uncertainty of sufficient Federal, State and local funding for general and categorical programs for the 2012-2013 school year, program reductions, student

and district needs, consolidation of classes, re-alignment of staff and elimination of positions to more efficiently and effectively use the

school system resources, and

Whereas, positions occupied by retirees must be posted each year, and

Whereas, positions must now be made available for more senior teachers who are scheduled to return from leave, and

Whereas, the teacher does not have the required certification, and there may be more qualified individuals who will apply for these positions, and

Whereas, because of these concerns, and in accordance with Title 16 of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, the Superintendent has recommended that the employment of certain teachers be terminated at the end of the 2011-2012 school year, and

Whereas, the Superintendent has sent prior notice to said teachers informing them of the specific reasons for their termination, and

Be it RESOLVED that said teachers be terminated at the close of the school year under provisions of Title 16 of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, and

Be it further RESOLVED that the Superintendent notify those teachers of the School Committee's action to terminate their employment.

NO. 12-02-08 - RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following non-certified employee(s) be appointed:

**Joseph Apostolico, Part Time Custodian
Plant**

Effective Date...February 14, 2012

Authorization...Replacement

Fiscal Note...11747050 51110

Colin Vidos, Bus Monitor

Transportation

Effective Date...January 23, 2012

Authorization...Replacement

Fiscal Note...13445090 51110

Joan Piccoli, Bus Monitor

Transportation

Effective Date...January 23, 2012

Authorization...Replacement

Fiscal Note...12845090 51110

Tabetha Chase, Bus Driver (Probationary)

Transportation

Effective Date...January 30, 2012

Authorization...Replacement

Fiscal Note...10345190 51110

John Theroux, Bus Driver (Probationary)

Transportation

Effective Date...January 30, 2012

Authorization...Replacement

Fiscal Note...10345190 51110

Vincent Amore, Jr., Bus Driver (Probationary)

Transportation

Effective Date...February 27, 2012

Authorization...Replacement

Fiscal Note...12645190 51110

NO. 12-02-09 - RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following non-certified personnel be appointed as substitutes on a temporary basis as needed:

Stacey Lanigan, Secretary

Barbara Manni, Teacher Assistant

NO. 12-02-10- RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the retirement(s) of the following non-certified personnel be accepted:

Christine Cronan, Bus Driver

Transportation

Effective Date...February 14, 2012

NO. 12-02-11 - RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the resignation(s) of the following non-certified personnel be accepted:

Filippa Gruppso, Bus Monitor

Transportation

Effective Date...January 18, 2012

AnnMarie Folcarelli, Supported Employment Specialist

Pupil Personnel

Effective Date...February 10, 2012

Lisa Faella, Bus Driver

Transportation

Effective Date...January 26, 2012

Eldora Giblin, Bus Driver

Transportation

Effective Date...February 10, 2012

NO. 12-02-12 - RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following non-certified staff member be granted a leave of absence without compensation as provided in Article X Section C of the Agreement between the Cranston School Committee and the Cranston Teachers' Alliance Teacher Assistant/Bus Aide Unit:

Barbara Manzo, Bus Aide - January, 2012 to August 2012

NO. 12-02-13 - RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the termination of non-certified employee "A" be accepted:

NO. 12-02-14 - RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the termination of non-certified employee “B” be accepted:

POLICY AND PROGRAM

NO. 12-02-17 - RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following Field Trip(s) of Long Duration/Conference(s) be authorized:

Christine Luther-Morris, teacher at Cranston High School West, and approximately 17 students, to travel to Boston, MA for a Model United Nation Conference hosted by Boston University from February 24, 2012 – February 26, 2012, at no cost to the School Department. Please see the attached Field Trip of Long Duration form.

Superintendent Nero

One of the Resolutions was the retirement of Christine Cronan from Transportation after 31 years. I would like to wish Christine and her family a wonderful retirement and I hope she gets an opportunity to enjoy some things that were not enjoyed previously. Thank you.

SPONSORED BY MRS. MCFARLAND AND MR. TRAFICANTE

NO. 12-02-01 - RESOLVED, whereas, the Cranston City Council has approved and submitted a copy of Resolution #2012-2 requesting the

Cranston School Department's custodians collect trash at additional locations, and

Whereas, the Cranston School Committee submitted an approved Resolution #10-3-3 dated March 22, 2010, requesting to recalculate the School Department's sewer charge based upon a previous City Council Resolution which was the initial request for trash collections by the district, and

Whereas, the Cranston School Department has 27 school buildings, the City of Cranston has 17 buildings and Libraries has 4 buildings charged for sewer fees, and

Whereas, the charges for sewer fees are not standardized by the City of Cranston, and

Whereas, the current per fixture charge is \$42.70 for a charge of \$215,421.50 to the Cranston School District and a charge of \$145,991.30 to the City of Cranston per the calculation by the Public Works Department of the City of Cranston, and

Whereas, the current sewer charge to the City of Cranston is \$1,000 per building for a total of \$17,000 paid annually per tax collectors office of the City of Cranston, and

Whereas, the current sewer charge to the City of Cranston Libraries is \$508.46 per building for a total of \$ 2,033.84 paid annually per tax collectors office of the City of Cranston, and

Whereas, although current sewer charge to the School Department and the City of Cranston is calculated by the Public Works Office of the City of Cranston at a per fixture charge; however, payments to the

tax collector of the City of Cranston have been recalculated for the City of Cranston sewer fees only as budgeted annually by the City of Cranston, and

Be it RESOLVED that the Cranston School Department is again requesting the City of Cranston through the Tax Collectors recalculate a sewer charge similar to the City of Cranston reflecting \$1,000 per building for a total sewer charge to the Cranston School Department of \$27,000 annually, and

Be it further RESOLVED that the City of Cranston notify the School Department of the appropriate tax collections changes effectively for sewer fees based upon City of Cranston's sewer fee of a per building charge of \$1,000 per building annually.

Moved by Mr. Traficante and seconded by Mrs. Culhane for discussion.

Mrs. Ruggieri

With regards to this resolution, I've been doing some research on my own and have come up with a couple of other alternatives to the language that I wanted to offer. According to the definitions of building sewer charges, we actually fall under the heading of buildings containing clubs, libraries and hospitals. This is normally the category that most Cities and Towns use to charge sewer fees to their schools. The City of Cranston chooses not to use this rate for our schools. We are actually getting charged a per fixture charge which has been, as of July, \$44.11 per fixture. It did go up according to the paper. What they're charging for any buildings containing

clubs, libraries or hospitals is \$525.24 for each unit in excess of three.

Since all of our schools do contain libraries, I believe that we do qualify under this category. Currently what happens is the City of Cranston only charges itself \$1,000 per building for the 17 buildings that they own. This rate went up a little bit because for their budget year, they're charging themselves \$18,500. We are actually getting charged \$215,421.50 for the 27 school buildings that we do not own but that we use. According to this resolution, they're asking for the sewer charge to be \$1000 per building that the City charges itself for what they call a public building. They're charging themselves a public building rate of \$1,000. What I propose is that we ask for them to charge us the \$525.24 rate that they are currently charging our City libraries. That is the heading I believe we fall under; there is no specific category for schools. They do list specific categories for restaurants, cafes, clubs, sea licenses, buildings used for manufacturing or industrial operations, public buildings, dwellings and apartments, buildings containing retail establishments and offices and again the buildings containing clubs, libraries and hospitals. There is no specific destination for our schools to fall under. The most reasonable one would be the one that contains libraries. This is in the form of an amendment to the resolution.

Mrs. McFarland thanked Mrs. Ruggieri on her research on the above amendment.

Mrs. Culhane

My only concern with this is that while we do have buildings that contain libraries, we are a public building that can be used by the public for different events and it's not like the libraries that we have can be used by the public. Mrs. Ruggieri noted that they charge \$50 to use space in the public library. Mrs. Culhane noted that it can not be utilized the same way as the public libraries can where people can use materials for research, etc. I don't know if we'll get caught up in something like some kind of semantics with the City over that fact.

Mrs. Ruggieri

It's possible but I think that because there's been no clear definition of where our buildings fall; what category our buildings fall under, that if we start out saying we believe because it's not regulated; the charges are done by theclearly it's not regulated in a equitable manner because the actual charge for the City buildings is upwards of \$....if they charge the same rate equitably between the buildings that the City owns and uses them as public buildings vs. the 27 buildings that we own, it would bewe're just looking for this to be adjusted so that it clearly reflects the three entities that fall under this category. There's actually, if you look under the City's budget, there's not a line item under the libraries for sewer charge. I'm not really sure where they're putting that or how it's being charged but it's just not equitable and that's what we're looking for. Ms. Iannazzi thanked Mrs. Ruggieri for her research.

There being no more discussion on the amendment, the roll was

called. All were in favor of the amendment.

There being no further discussion on the Resolution as amended, the roll was taken:

Mrs. McFarland Yes Mr. Bloom Yes

Mr. Traficante Yes Mrs. Culhane Yes

Mr. Lombardi Yes Mrs. Ruggieri Yes

Ms. Iannazzi Yes

BUSINESS

NO. 12-02-15 - RESOLVED, that the 2012-2013 Operating Budget, as recommended by the Superintendent, be approved.

Moved by Mr. Lombardi, seconded by Mr. Bloom for discussion. At this time, Ms. Iannazzi asked Mr. Lombardi to take the Chair.

Ms. Iannazzi

I have a proposed amendment to the budget this evening. If members of the School Committee look in their packets, Mr. Balducci prepared an analysis to incorporate the loss of revenue in the additional expenditures as a result of the most recent Board of Regents vote to support two Achievement First Schools serving our Cranston population. I would offer an amendment to incorporate those two line items from Mr. Balducci's packet which would basically start in the year 2013-2014 and result in a loss of \$400,000 to Cranston Public Schools going all the way through 2018-2019 where that year it will

result in a combined loss of \$2.4 million to the Cranston Public School system. I would just ask that we add those line items to the budget.

The motion to amend the budget was made by Ms. Iannazzi, seconded by Mr. Bloom. The roll was called:

Mr. Bloom Yes Mr. Lombardi Yes

Mrs. Culhane Yes Mrs. McFarland Yes

Mrs. Ruggieri Yes Mr. Traficante Yes

Ms. Iannazzi Yes

Mr. Bloom

Along the same lines, I would proposed that we amend the forecast moving forward to include other post employment benefits namely, Health Insurance. If you look at the last page of the forecast, it has been reflected on a pay as you go basis which is the way that we have been handling it currently and a funding shortfall has been identified after the surplus deficit line item on the bottom. I propose that we amend the forecast to include the funding shortfall in each particular year.

The motion to amend the budget was made by Mr. Bloom and seconded by Mrs. Culhane. The roll was called:

Mr. Traficante Yes Mrs. Ruggieri Yes

Mrs. McFarland Yes Mr. Lombardi Yes

Mrs. Culhane Yes Mr. Bloom Yes

Ms. Iannazzi Yes

Mr. Bloom

I would like to amend the budget to include an additional expense of \$195,400 for Health Insurance to bring it up to the level that we've been consistently forecasting it at 4%. This year we have forecasted 3% and even though we have a large forecast right now, looking forward in health insurance, we have had deficits in the previous years and I think for conservative reasons we should budget for that in accordance for prior years.

Mr. Traficante seconded this motion for discussion:

Ms. Iannazzi

Mr. Bloom do you have an offset reduction in expenditures or are you just offering that as a.....Mr. Bloom reported that he would recommend that it be added to the same line-item that we have right now for debt restructuring which would increase that to approximately \$1.4 million.

Mr. Balducci

If I understand Mr. Bloom correctly, he doesn't want to add those costs directly to the bottom line so he wants to use the debt restructuring place holder account right now. I'm assuming he wants to increase it by \$195,000 and so it has a -0- effect on the bottom line. So we have a credit balance right now sitting in debt restructuring of \$1.2 million; we will increase that credit by an additional \$195,000 and

we will offset it by an increase in the health account by \$195,000 again. It just has a -0- impact on the bottom line. It allows us to increase ...we've been forecasting a 4% increase in health in the forecast so I think that Mr. Bloom just wants to stay consistent and increase next years estimate up to 4%.

Mr. Nero

What was the recommendation that we increase our health care? Mr. Balducci answered that through the Collaborative from 0 to 3. We went on the high end of 3.

Mr. Nero asked that if it goes above three %, we end up in debt restructuring anyways because we owe that money. Mr. Balducci answered that this is correct. He noted that

we will receive our final rate estimates some time in mid-March to early April from the Collaborative but the conversation that he had with the Collaborative was back in late December early January when we were preparing the budget. As we go through the budget and process, i.e. with the Mayor and the City Council, we will have a more solid number to use.

Mrs. Ruggieri asked Mr. Balducci in prior years when they made recommendations for you to increase, were they stayed within the range? Mr. Balducci answered that for the most part sometimes we were lucky enough where if we increased to 5% and they came back and said that we were going to be level funded the working rate but for the most part, yes, the estimate was on target. Mrs. Ruggieri

asked if he would be comfortable leaving it at the 3% or would he suggest the 4%? Mr. Balducci noted that given the successful year we're having so far in the last seven months and we're experiencing a very positive trend in our health cost, I am safe to leave it at 3%.

Mr. Bloom

Just a couple of other comments; last year we had a deficit in the account, am I correct? Mr. Balducci answered that it was \$2.2 million.

Mr. Bloom noted that we have an outstanding loan balance of almost \$700,000 which is correct; so the cumulative deficit is \$2.9 million?

Mr. Balducci answered that no, the \$2.2 million takes into consideration theA discussion ensued at this time.

Mrs. Culhane No **Mr. Lombardi** Yes

Mrs. McFarland Yes **Mr. Traficante** No

Mr. Bloom Yes **Mrs. Ruggieri** No

Ms. Iannazzi No

The amendment fails.

Mr. Bloom

Just for consistency with last year when we adopted a budget last year we did not have a deficit restructuring line that was a line that we adopted in June in order to balance the budget and I would like to propose an amendment to re-classify that as Concessions or Savings and we would make a commitment to repay, in full, our installment to the City. Ms. Iannazzi asked to clarify by renaming the debt restructuring or the debt repayment line? Mr. Bloom answered that

he is renaming the debt restructuring line, which are two separate things. He noted that we have a line item called Deficit Reduction, which is the installment payment to the City for about \$1.6 million and in June of last year we adopted a line item called Debt Restructuring for \$1.25 million in order to plug our budget as an offset to the loan repayment and I am proposing that for our adopted budget for this year that we reclassify that as “Concessions or Savings” not as Debt Restructuring. The motion was seconded by Mr. Traficante for discussion:

Mrs. Culhane

I am just perplexed as to why we would want to pigeon hole ourselves in that way. To even consider calling it any kind of concession, I don't know where we would be going with that. I'm not quite certain what your angle is. Mr. Bloom explained right now we have an obligation to repay the City \$1.6 million. This budget, if we adopt it as it is with this particular line item, we are basically telling the City we are only paying \$300,000 and I think we need to be telling the City that we are going to make the full payment this year and that we are going to be looking for other savings for the amount of \$1.25 million in order to balance our budget for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Lombardi

Am I missing the point of the \$1.2 million as an actual savings? Mr. Balducci answered that right now as we turn to next year's budget we are still in conversations' with our unions going into next year. The

\$1.2 million has not been identified yet so we are just carrying over that projection into next year's budget. Mr. Lombardi stated that ultimately it will have to become an actual number. Mr. Balducci answered that we will have to achieve savings elsewhere within the budget. It could come from other sources and not necessarily from "concessions". Ultimately that becomes an actual number.

Mr. Bloom

Right now debt restructuring implies that we are postponing a debt repayment as opposed to taking position that we are going to find cost savings or concessions within our budget for this fiscal year. Debt restructuring means that the debt is going to be moved around. It does not imply that we are making a commitment to repay \$1.6 million this year to the City. Debt restructuring is not a savings it is a movement of the monies fromif we do not find \$1.2 million in savings we will be going back to the City and ask them to take \$1.2 million and tack it on the back of our loan to them. We are showing a budget where we are not making a commitment to repay the \$1.6 million. If we label that savings, wherever it comes from, we are making a commitment to find/to close that hole. A discussion ensued in regards to this amendment.

Mr. Balducci

We seem to be hung up on the wording but again we have used in the past budget savings to be determined or future budget savings. We have used those type of descriptions in an attempt to balance a

budget and it has to be a concrete number.

Mrs. Culhane

As far as I'm concerned, I just feel that by leaving it at this, we're addressing that it's a line item; we're acknowledging the fact that we understand that we have to make a payment to the City of some sort. I'm just concerned knowing how certain people on the City side think, if they look at that as anything other than us working with our debt, they're going to be hounding us, asking us where we are getting our concessions; what programs we're cutting and where we are getting our savings from. A lengthy discussion ensued. Mr. Balducci concurred with this amendment which it will be called, "Budget savings to be determined".

There being no further discussion on the amendment, the roll was called:

Mrs. McFarland Yes Mrs. Culhane Yes

Mrs. Ruggieri Yes Mr. Bloom Yes

Mr. Lombardi Yes Mr. Traficante Yes

Ms. Iannazzi Yes

At this time the roll was taken on the Budget as amended:

Mr. Traficante Yes Mr. Bloom Yes

Mrs. Ruggieri Yes Mrs. Culhane Yes

Mrs. McFarland Yes Mr. Lombardi Yes

Ms. Iannazzi Yes

The Budget Resolution Passed.

NO. 12-02-16 – RESOLVED, that the 2012-2013 Capital Budget, as recommended by the Superintendent, be approved:

Bain Middle School Replace Exterior Windows \$700,000

Bain Middle School Replace All Corridor Tile 425,000

Park View Middle School Replace All Corridor Tile 365,000 Western

Hills Middle School Replace All Corridor Tile 325,000

Stadium Elementary School Reconstruction of Playground 85,000

Stone Hill Elementary School Reconstruction of Playground 85,000

On the above resolution, a motion was made by Mr. Lombardi and seconded by Mrs. Ruggieri for discussion:

Mrs. Culhane

I have a question. Last year we were trying to replace windows at Park View and now we're trying to do it at Bain. We didn't get the money for the windows at Park View. I'm wondering why we decided Bain this year.

Mr. Zisseron

Park View is still on the table. That is not lost. Every year we present them a Capital Budget to the City based upon the capital monies that we have. We asked for Science Rooms, we asked for Park View

windows; that was approved by School Committee and the City Council but the City never sold the bond. We've got a \$9.5 million school bond and it's still there. This year when I put the Capital Budget together, I used other monies within that bond to get authorization first from the School Committee and then from the City Council. We had a meeting recently with the finance director of the City. In attendance was Mr. Balducci, the Superintendent, Mr. Bloom and myself. The discussion centered around the \$9.5 million bond. We've got \$170,000 in cash for the playgrounds but it wasn't approved last year. They took it out which I don't understand why. The discussion took place on the bond and the City, my impression was that they were ready to move forward in selling that bond. If they sell the bond, I need \$2.3

million to do the windows at Park View and the Science Rooms. If they go out and sell that bond, I am not going to have enough time to get that ready to go out to bid and to do it this summer. So this would be a project for the 2013-14 school year. What I'm asking for this year, which is \$1.9 million, would then be done 13-14. I was encouraged and I think that they are finally going to sell off either the whole bond or at least what I'm asking for; \$4.3 million. Over the next two years, we can get moving on these projects.

Mrs. Culhane

Those bonds were voted on by the citizens about 5 years ago; if I could make a suggestion, maybe it would behoove us to take pictures of the broken windows at these schools when we submit the Capital

Budget so that the City Council can understand that this isn't a "want", it's a "need".

Mr. Zisserson

The first step is to City Planning Commission. They review it and they forward to the Mayor. The Mayor then makes the recommendation to the City Council and the City Council has the final say.

Mrs. Ruggieri

My concern going forward is that these projects that have been approved and voted on and bonds, etc; there's no pressure anywhere for them to actually move forward with these projects and I'm wondering, when I look at the City Plan Commission from 2011 and I look at the different projects that were listed out for each department and then I looked at ours and ours was \$175,000 for 2010-11 to replace the Science Wing roof at Bain, which was done. Of the \$3.3 million that was approved for 2010-11, we actually were able to get \$175,000 for a project. Then 2011-2012 we asked for \$860,000 of a \$2.5 million project budget. I'm wondering if at some point we should start putting some pressure on our elected officials to actually listen to the voters when they approve these bonds to move forward and to say that the improvements to be made on the City side have not been made on the school side in an equitable manner. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Bloom

I was present at that meeting and I just wanted to second what Joel was saying. The Finance Director appeared receptive to moving forward with selling the bond so I don't think he would be receptive if there was...if he didn't feel that the financial resources were there. I would agree; however, that we push.

Mrs. McFarland

When you met with them did you talk about the debt that they were actually taking off the books? How much are they paying off? Mr. Bloom stated that his recollection was that it was not much at all. Mr. Votto noted it was around \$5 million. Has the capital budget gone to the Planning Commission yet? Mr. Zisseron answered, "no". A discussion ensued.

Mr. Traficante

Joel, in your discussion with the Finance Director, did you discuss Repair and Maintenance? Mr. Zisseron answered that there is no more money in that bond. Mr. Traficante asked if they discussed the possibility of them coming forward in this election with a referendum to basically place on the agenda for the general public to vote on because we have absolutely zero dollars for repair and maintenance and I doubt very much if the Asset Protection money in your budget is going to cover all the necessities.

Mr. Zisseron noted that they are putting together a bond for other Repair and Renovations, so that can be used for any project we

recommend. That will come to the committee first, then the City, then the Legislature and also to RIDE.

There being no further discussion on the Capital Budget, the roll was called:

Mrs. McFarland Yes Mrs. Ruggieri Yes

Mr. Bloom Yes Mrs. Culhane Yes

Mr. Lombardi Yes Mr. Traficante Yes

Ms. Iannazzi Yes

Public Hearing on Non-agenda Items – None

Announcement of Future Meetings – February 16, 2012, March 14 & March 19, 2012

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Lombardi and seconded by Mrs. Ruggieri. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank S. Lombardi

School Committee Clerk